



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,913	03/16/2005	Thomas Banik	2002P13626WOUS	9056

7590 07/10/2008
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

NORTON, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/10/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/527,913	Applicant(s) BANIK ET AL.	
	Examiner JENNIFER L. NORTON	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-30,32,33,35-38,41 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-30,32,33,35-38,41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a **Final Office Action** in response to the Amendment received on 26 March 2008. Claims 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30 and 37 been amended. Claims 1-20, 31, 34, 39 and 40 have been previously cancelled. Claims 21-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 41 and 42 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The amendment to the Claims was received on 26 March 2008. The correction is acceptable and the objection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21-26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,499,001 (hereinafter Meyer) in view of U.S. Patent 6,920,502 (hereinafter Araujo).

5. As per claim 21, Meyer teaches a system for process interfacing within an automation scenario for distributed engineering systems, the system comprising:

a server (Fig. 1, element 14) for providing at least one application required for engineering (col. 4, lines 8-14 and col. 5, lines 14-20);

a first client (col. 3, lines 62-66 and Fig. 1, element 12) for:

directly accessing process and control data on automation devices (col. 4, lines 16-31, col. 5, lines 21-25 and 41-54, col. 7, lines 16-20; i.e. the process station may include any location within a manufacturing facility at which a fabrication step, inspection step or test step is performed, e.g. fabrication instrument, inspection instrument or test instrument),

wherein the first client is a programming device (col. 3, lines 62-66 and col. 5, lines 26-41),

using the application provided by the server remotely via the first client by a user (col. 5, lines 14-20), and

setting up an online communication channel maintained for any length of time between the first client and the server (col. 9, lines 4-15);

first mechanisms (i.e. an internal interface card) in the server for feeding data of the automation devices into the server via the communication channel (col. 4, lines 8-14); and

second mechanisms (Fig. 1, element 28 of Fig. 1, element 12) in the first client for linking the applications to the automation devices (col. 5, lines 21-35), wherein

the first mechanisms have a first interface (i.e. the function of the internal interface card) to a current communication channel (col. 4, lines 8-14) and a second interface (Fig. 1, element 36) to the applications (col. 5, lines 14-20), and wherein

the first mechanisms (i.e. an internal interface card) are provided for communicating with the second mechanisms (Fig. 1, element 28 of Fig. 1, element 12) via the communication channel (col. 4, lines 8-10, col. 5, lines 21-26 and Fig. 1, element 22).

Meyer does not expressly teach the first mechanisms comprise software that establishes a virtual process interface between a second client and the automation devices, and the virtual process interface provides online access from the second client to the automation devices via the communication channel by means of tunneling of data packets.

Araujo teaches the first mechanisms (col. 15, lines 46-59 and Fig. 1, element 200) comprise software that establishes a virtual process interface between a second client (col. 14, lines 45-49 and col. 15, lines 20-37; i.e. the remote access client), and the virtual process interface provides online access from via the communication channel by means of tunneling of data packets (col. 14, lines 45-49; i.e. HTTPS).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of to Meyer include the first mechanisms comprise software that establishes a virtual process interface between a

second client, and the virtual process interface provides online access from via the communication channel by means of tunneling of data packets to advantageously, provide a remote stationed user access to networked based applications (col. 1, lines 32-42), which eliminates the need to install, configure, or maintain any user applications programs on the remote client, thereby, dramatically reducing cost of ownership of the client PC (col. 13, lines 29-33).

6. As per claim 22, Meyer teaches as set forth above the first client is a thin client (col. 5, lines 14-20 and col. 9, lines 27-30).

7. As per claim 23, Meyer teaches as set forth above the server is designed as a terminal server for use simultaneously by one or more participants (col. 9, lines 30-33; i.e. the database 30 is located the server (col. 4, lines 55-58; hence the server is designed as a terminal server for use simultaneously by one or more participants).

8. As per claim 24, Meyer does not expressly teach the communication channel is designed as a Remote Desktop Protocol for transmitting data to one or more participants in real time via one or more separate virtual channels.

Araujo teaches the communication channel is designed as a Remote Desktop Protocol (col. 15, lines 34-38) for transmitting data to one or more participants in real time via one or more separate virtual channels (col. 15, lines 20-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of to Meyer include the communication channel is designed as a Remote Desktop Protocol for transmitting data to one or more participants in real time via one or more separate virtual channels to advantageously, provide a remote stationed user access to networked based applications (col. 1, lines 32-42), which eliminates the need to install, configure, or maintain any user applications programs on the remote client, thereby, dramatically reducing cost of ownership of the client PC (col. 13, lines 29-33).

9. As per claim 25, Meyer teaches as set forth above the first mechanisms (i.e. an internal interface card) are provided for feeding data of further automation devices into the server (col. 4, lines 55-58 and col. 7, lines 20-23) via the communication channel via connection of the further automation devices to the second client (col. 9, lines 8-15).

10. As per claim 26, Meyer teaches as set forth above a transmission of data in the communication channel is provided via an Intranet (col. 9, lines 4-8 and 11-13) and/or an Internet (col. 9, lines 4-8 and 14-15).

11. As per claim 28, Meyer does not expressly teach a transmission of data using a Remote Desktop Protocol is provided from further data sources present in the system using HTTP and/or FTP.

Araujo teaches a transmission of data using a Remote Desktop Protocol is provided from further data sources present in the system using HTTP (col. 15, lines 34-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of to Meyer include a transmission of data using a Remote Desktop Protocol is provided from further data sources present in the system using HTTP to advantageously, provide a remote stationed user access to networked based applications (col. 1, lines 32-42), which eliminates the need to install, configure, or maintain any user applications programs on the remote client, thereby, dramatically reducing cost of ownership of the client PC (col. 13, lines 29-33).

12. As per claim 29, Meyers teaches as set forth above the system is provided for use across different sites (col. 9, lines 9-15).

13. As per claim 30, Meyer teaches a method for process interfacing within an automation scenario for distributed engineering systems, the method comprising:

providing an application required for engineering (col. 4, lines 8-14 and col. 5, lines 14-20) by a server (Fig. 1, element 14);

accessing automation devices (col. 4, lines 16-31 and col. 7, lines 16-20; i.e. the process station may include any location within a manufacturing facility at which a fabrication step, inspection step or test step is performed, e.g. fabrication instrument, inspection instrument or test instrument) that supply process data via a first client (col. 3, lines 62-66, col. 5, lines 21-25, col. 7, lines 16-20 and Fig. 1, element 12);

setting up an online communication channel between the first client and the server (col. 9, lines 4-15);

feeding the data of the automation devices into the server via the communication channel (col. 4, lines 55-58 and col. 7, lines 20-23 and Fig. 1, element 22);

linking the applications to the automation devices (col. 5, lines 21-26),

wherein communication takes place with a second mechanism (Fig. 1, element 28 of Fig. 1, element 12) in the first client via the communication channel (col. 5, lines 21-26 and Fig. 1, element 22) via a first mechanism (i.e. an internal interface card) in the server (col. 4, lines 8-14) having a first interface (i.e. the function of the internal interface card) to a current communication channel (col. 4, lines 8-14) and a second interface (Fig. 1, element 36) to the applications (col. 5, lines 14-20),

wherein data of further automation devices is fed by the first mechanism (i.e. an internal interface card) into the server (col. 4, lines 55-58 and col. 7, lines 20-23) via

the communication channel via at least one further client (co. 9, lines 8-15) and the first mechanism feeds data of further automation devices into the server (col. 4, lines 55-58 and col. 7, lines 20-23) over the communication channel via at least one further client (col. 9, lines 8-15) and enabling the accessing of automation devices connected to the first client (col. 5, lines 21-26) and configure one client system from another client system (col. 5, lines 26-35); and

using at least one of the clients as a programming device by a user (col. 3, lines 62-66 and col. 5, lines 26-41).

Meyer does not expressly teach the further client from any client within the system by routing in the server making a virtual peer-2-peer communication for direct communication between the participating clients to access one client system from another client system.

Araujo teaches the further client from any client within the system by routing in the server making a virtual peer-2-peer communication for direct communication between the participating clients to access one client system from another client system (col. 15, lines 20-38; i.e. Remote Desktop Protocol).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Meyer to include the further client from any client within the system by routing in the server making a virtual peer-2-peer communication for direct communication between the participating clients to

access one client system from another client system to advantageously, provide a remote stationed user access to networked based applications (col. 1, lines 32-42), which eliminates the need to install, configure, or maintain any user applications programs on the remote client, thereby, dramatically reducing cost of ownership of the client PC (col. 13, lines 29-33).

14. As per claim 32, Meyer teaches as set forth above one or more participants can use the server simultaneously (col. 9, lines 30-33; i.e. the database 30 is located the server (col. 4, lines 55-58; hence the server is designed as a terminal server for use simultaneously by one or more participants).

15. As per claim 33, Meyer does not expressly teach a Remote Desktop Protocol for transmitting data to one or more participants in real-time via one or more separate virtual channels is used as the communication channel.

Araujo teaches a Remote Desktop Protocol (col. 15, lines 34-38) for transmitting data to one or more participants in real-time via one or more separate virtual channels is used as the communication channel (col. 15, lines 20-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Meyer to include a Remote Desktop Protocol for transmitting data to one or more participants in real-time via one

or more separate virtual channels is used as the communication channel to advantageously, provide a remote stationed user access to networked based applications (col. 1, lines 32-42), which eliminates the need to install, configure, or maintain any user applications programs on the remote client, thereby, dramatically reducing cost of ownership of the client PC (col. 13, lines 29-33).

16. As per claim 35, Meyer teaches as set forth above data is transmitted in the communication channel over an intranet (col. 9, lines 4-8 and 11-13) and/or the Internet (col. 9, lines 4-8 and 14-15).

17. As per claim 37, Meyer does not expressly teach data using a Remote Desktop Protocol from further data sources present in the system is transmitted employing HTTP and/or FTP.

Araugo teaches a Remote Desktop Protocol from further data sources present in the system is transmitted employing HTTP (col. 15, lines 34-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Meyer to include a Remote Desktop Protocol from further data sources present in the system is transmitted employing HTTP to advantageously, provide a remote stationed user access to networked based applications (col. 1, lines 32-42), which eliminates the need to install,

configure, or maintain any user applications programs on the remote client, thereby, dramatically reducing cost of ownership of the client PC (col. 13, lines 29-33).

18. As per claim 38, Meyer teaches as set forth above the system is used across different sites (col. 9, lines 9-15).

19. As per claim 41, Meyer teaches as set forth above the client is a thin client (col. 5, lines 14-20 and col. 9, lines 27-30).

20. As per claim 42, Meyer teaches as set forth above the thin client depends primarily on the server for processing activities (col. 4, lines 8-14 and col. 5, lines 14-20), and mainly focuses on conveying input and output between a user and the server (col. 5, lines 21-35 and col. 9, lines 27-30).

21. Claims 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer in view of Araujo in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0010560 (hereinafter Sandage).

22. As per claim 27, Meyers in view of Araujo does not expressly teach a transmission of data from the clients is provided using a Remote Desktop Protocol via a Wireless LAN.

Sandage teaches a transmission of data from the clients is provided using a Remote Desktop Protocol via a Wireless LAN (pgs. 1-2, par. [0014] and pg. 3, par. [0023]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Meyer in view of Araujo to include a transmission of data from the clients is provided using a Remote Desktop Protocol via a Wireless LAN to provide control operation of a system from remote locations using the infrared signals, wherein the target system is not required to be in the same room or line of sight with the host computer system (pg. 1, par. [0005]).

23. As per claim 36, Meyer in view of Araugo does not expressly teach data is transmitted from the client using the Remote Desktop Protocol via a Wireless LAN.

Sandage teaches a transmission of data is transmitted from the client using the Remote Desktop Protocol via a Wireless LAN (pgs. 1-2, par. [0014] and pg. 3, par. [0023]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Meyer in view of Araugo to include a transmission of data is transmitted from the client using the Remote Desktop Protocol via a Wireless LAN to provide control operation of a system from remote

locations using the infrared signals, wherein the target system is not required to be in the same room or line of sight with the host computer system (pg. 1, par. [0005]).

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments see Remarks pgs. 7-8, filed 26 March 2008 with respect to claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

25. To further clarify the record, the Examiner has addressed Applicant's arguments with reference to the prior art.

26. Applicant argues the prior art fails to teach, in summary, automation devices connected to a client terminal to provide control and process data. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Meyer teaches (col. 4, lines 16-31), "Preferably, the process station devices 16 are computers, such as personal computers. Alternatively, the process station devices 16 are network terminals, each consisting of a display device 24, input device 26, and network interface device 28. As with the request entry devices 12, the invention is not limited to any particular number of process station devices 16. In the preferred embodiment, there is at least one process station device 16 associated with each process station in a manufacturing facility. For purposes of this description, it should be understood that a process station may include any location within a manufacturing facility at which a fabrication step, inspection step, or test step is performed. As described in more detail below, a process operator uses a process station device 16 to receive process

instructions from the central instruction processing server 14, and to input information in regard to the process station."

(col. 5, lines 21-54) "In the preferred embodiment, when the engineer runs the ERR generation module 36, the module 36 generates a graphic display at the request entry device 12 presenting to the engineer the standard process step instructions followed during a normal production run of the material. At this point, the engineer may modify the instructions to generate modified or "special" process instructions to be followed during an engineering run. For example, the engineer may specify a different set of process temperatures or pressures for a particular process step. Alternatively, the engineer may specify that different or additional testing be performed on the material at a particular step. These changes to the instructions are preferably performed using keyboard or "point-and-click" graphical user interface processing.

Preferably, the ERR generation module 36 also presents to the engineer a summary dialog box wherein the engineer may enter a brief summary of the purpose of the engineering run, and any pertinent comments. This summary is stored with the special instructions in the Engineering Run Request record.

When the engineer is satisfied with the special processing instructions and the summary, the ERR generation module 36 saves the Engineering Run Request record with a particular Engineering Run Request identifier which is preferably included in the file name of the Engineering Run Request record. Once saved in memory on the instruction processing server 14, the Engineering Run Request record is accessible to other computers on the network 22, as described in more detail hereinafter. Preferably, when the Engineering Run Request record is later opened, such as on a process station device 16, the instructions that are different from standard instructions are highlighted, such as in a different color text."

(col. 7, lines 16-20) "Some process steps require data to be collected that characterizes some property of the processed material. According to the invention, such data is downloaded from a test instrument at the process station to the process station device 16, such as over an RS-232 bus. Preferably, the ERR processing module

40 writes this data to memory in the process station device 16 where it is stored for later download to the relational database 30."

In summary, Meyer teaches the process station may include any location within a manufacturing facility at which a fabrication step, inspection step or test step is performed, e.g. fabrication instrument, inspection instrument or test instrument, connected to the first client; hence Meyer meets Applicant's claimed limitation of, in summary, automation devices connected to a client terminal to provide control and process data.

27. The Examiner emphasizes that all anticipated components and limitations of pending claims are present in the prior art as supported above. In addition, the Examiner notes the limitation of "an interface card ... that establishes virtual process interface between a second client and the automation devices, wherein the virtual process interface provides online access from the second client to the automation devices via the communication channel by means of tunneling of data packets" (see Remarks, pg. 8, paragraph 1) was newly presented in the Amendment After Non-Final received on 26 March 2008 by the Office, and has been addressed as set forth in the Office Action above.

28. Applicant's arguments see Remarks pgs. 8-9, filed 26 March 2008 with respect to claims 24-30, 32, 33, 35-38, 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

29. With respect to claim 30, the Examiner has furthered clarified the rejection of claim 30 with respect to the claimed limitation, "first client". Meyer teaches to the "first client" in col. 3, lines 62-66 and Fig. 1, element 12, recited below for convenience:

(col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-4) "In a preferred embodiment, the request entry devices 12 are computers, such as personal computers. Alternatively, the request entry devices 12 are network terminals, each consisting of a display device 24, an input device 26, and a network interface device 28. Although one request entry device 12 is depicted in FIG. 1, the invention is not limited to, any particular number of request entry devices. There may be many such devices 12 connected to the network 22 and located in engineering offices and computing centers throughout a company facility.

30. In regards to Applicant's argument that Meyer does not teach, "(an) interface card (col. 4, lines 8-14) does not create virtual communications channels for feeding data of further automation devices into the server over the communication channel via at least one further client and enabling the accessing of automation devices connected to the first client and the further client from any client within the system by routing in the server making a virtual peer-2-peer communication for direct communication between the participating clients to access and configure one client system from another client system." (see Remarks pg. 8, paragraph 4), the Examiner recognizes the Applicant has not accounted for the combination of Meyer and Araugo under 35 U.S.C 103(a) for this limitation as set forth in the Non-Office Action, mailed on 26 December 2007.

Art Unit: 2121

31. With respect to claim 30, the Examiner has furthered clarified the rejection of claim 30 with respect to the claimed limitation, "automation devices". Meyer teaches to "automation devices" in col. 4, lines 16-31 and col. 7, lines 16-20 recited below for convenience:

Meyer teaches (col. 4, lines 16-31), "Preferably, the process station devices 16 are computers, such as personal computers. Alternatively, the process station devices 16 are network terminals, each consisting of a display device 24, input device 26, and network interface device 28. As with the request entry devices 12, the invention is not limited to any particular number of process station devices 16. In the preferred embodiment, there is at least one process station device 16 associated with each process station in a manufacturing facility. For purposes of this description, it should be understood that a process station may include any location within a manufacturing facility at which a fabrication step, inspection step, or test step is performed. As described in more detail below, a process operator uses a process station device 16 to receive process instructions from the central instruction processing server 14, and to input information in regard to the process station."

(col. 7, lines 16-20) "Some process steps require data to be collected that characterizes some property of the processed material. According to the invention, such data is downloaded from a test instrument at the process station to the process station device 16, such as over an RS-232 bus. Preferably, the ERR processing module 40 writes this data to memory in the process station device 16 where it is stored for later download to the relational database 30."

32. With respect to Applicant's argument, "Meyer is configured as a client-server topography. Changing this to a peer-to-peer system would completely change Meyer's topography, and would be a disadvantage." The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner notes Applicant's arguments, and refers to the rejection of claims 21 and 30 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer in view of Araujo. Hence, the combination of Meyer in view of Araujo meet Applicant's claimed limitations.

Furthermore, Meyer teaches a plurality of client machines connected to a network (col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-4), and the execution of instructions from any computer or terminal on the network (col. 5, lines 17-20). Hence, it would be obvious to modify the teaching of Meyer to include a peer-to-peer system to reduce time consumption and company resources to reliably providing to process operators process change instructions associated with an engineering experiment, verifying that the process changes have been correctly implemented at each step in the process, and making the results of the engineering experiment readily available to the company community (col. 2, lines 3-9).

33. The Examiner emphasizes that all anticipated components and limitations of pending claims are present in the prior art as supported above. In addition, the Examiner notes the limitation of "on-line access to automation devices" (see Remarks, pg. 9, paragraph 1) in claim 20 was newly presented in the Amendment After Non-Final received on 26 March 2008 by the Office, and has been addressed as set forth in the Office Action above.

34. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Araugo teaches to advantageously, provide a remote stationed user access to networked based applications (col. 1, lines 32-42), which eliminates the need to install, configure, or maintain any user applications programs on the remote client, thereby, dramatically reducing cost of ownership of the client PC (col. 13, lines 29-33).

35.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to remote device management systems.

U.S. Patent No. 7,313,590 discloses a system for directly establishing network connections between a client and server system by means of a single compiled file that

does not require an additional network communications system such as a web browser or other supporting application.

U.S. Patent No. 7,313,592 discloses a system in which a user can login to a World Wide Web server's (Web) application page and get help on the features assigned to an instrument such as a telephone or a service such as a voicemail system that is a configurable asset specifically assigned to that user.

U.S. Patent No. 7,313,605 discloses a network that supports VPNs is enhanced to allow users in one VPN to communicate with users in another VPN in the course of executing a predefined application, such as VoIP.

U.S. Patent No. 7,330,767 discloses an interface or display routine is provided for use in viewing and configuring a function block that performs integrated optimization and control within a process control system.

U.S. Patent No. 7,330,875 discloses a system and method for recording and playback of a live presentation that enables a reproduction of audio and visual aspects of the live presentation and enables on-demand viewing of the presentation at a later time.

U.S. Patent No. 7,346,405 discloses an interface for connecting one of a plurality of industrial machines having different data format and storage configurations to a communications medium for remote monitoring and control.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER L. NORTON whose telephone number is (571)272-3694. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

Art Unit: 2121

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Albert DeCady/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2121